```
1
    NATIONAL CAPITOL CONTRACTING
2
    RPTS HALATYN
3
    HJU322000
4
    MARKUP OF H.R. 2830; H.R. 3713; H.R. 4002;
5
    H.R. 4003; H.R. 4001; H.R. 4023
6
    Wednesday, November 18, 2015
7
    House of Representatives,
8
    Committee on the Judiciary,
9
    Washington, D.C.
10
         The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in
11
    Room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Bob
12
    Goodlatte, [chairman of the committee] presiding.
13
         Present: Representatives Goodlatte, Sensenbrenner,
14
    Chabot, Issa, King, Franks, Gohmert, Jordan, Poe, Chaffetz,
15
    Marino, Gowdy, Labrador, Farenthold, Collins, DeSantis,
16
    Walters, Buck, Ratcliffe, Trott, Bishop, Conyers, Nadler,
17
    Lofgren, Jackson Lee, Johnson, Pierluisi, Chu, Bass,
18
    Richmond, DelBene, Jeffries, and Peters.
19
         Staff Present: Shelley Husband, Staff Director; Branden
20
    Ritchie, Deputy Staff Director/Chief Counsel; Allison
```

Halataei, Parliamentarian & General Counsel; Kelsey
Williams, Clerk; Caroline Lynch, Chief Counsel, Subcommittee
on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations;
Stephanie Gadbois, Senior Counsel; Robert Parmiter, Senior
Counsel, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security
and Investigations; Joe Graupensperger, Minority Chief Crime
Counsel; Perry Apelbaum, Minority Chief Counsel, Chief-ofStaff; Tiffany Josslyn, Minority Deputy Chief Crime Counsel;
David Greengrass, Minority Counsel, Jason Everett, Minority
Counsel; Norberto Salinas, Minority Counsel, Aaron Hiller,
Minority Chief Oversight Counsel; Danielle Brown, Minority
Chief Legislative Counsel, Veronica Elligan, Professional
Staff Member; and Kurt May, Minority Counsel.

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

Chairman Goodlatte. The Judiciary Committee will come to order, and without objection, the chair is authorized to declare a recess of the committee at any time. Before we begin today's markup, I would like to take a moment to remember the life of our dear former colleague, Howard Coble. Howard, who was a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, until his retirement from Congress last year, passed away earlier this month.

I am confident that everyone on the dais and in the audience has a fond memory of Howard's quick wit, his mastery of college mascot trivia, and his endearing sense of humor, though perhaps no memories are as vibrant and colorful as his collection of Madras sports coats.

During his time in Congress, and while he was chairman Court, Intellectual Property, and Internet Subcommittee, Howard made promoting and protecting American innovation and creativity a priority. Howard was also a champion for the cause of criminal justice reform, fighting for some of the very topics that we will be addressing today. Howard was a dear friend, the perfect southern gentleman, and one of the kindest people I have ever met. He would also play tennis with me most Wednesday mornings for nearly 20 years. I am sure that I speak for everyone on the committee when I say that he will be missed. And the chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan and the

59 comments that he may have on that subject.

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

Thank you, Chairman Goodlatte. Mr. Conyers. deeply saddened to hear about the loss of our colleague, Howard Coble. As the longest serving Republican House member in North Carolina history, he was a man of many accomplishments, well known on Capitol Hill for graciousness and integrity. I am proud to call him my Howard was a great legislator, always willing to friend. work in a bipartisan manner to achieve results. judiciary, where I served with him during his time in Congress, he was a recognized leader in the intellectual Throughout his long and distinguished property area. career, he worked long to update our country's copyright and patent laws, through such historic legislation as Digital Millennium Copyright Act, the Sonny Bono Copyright Extension Act, the American Inventors Protection Act, and the Madrid Protocol Implementation Act. He was also critical to the effort to modernize laws regarding the cable and satellite industries.

Our colleague, Howard Coble, was a great public servant. I am honored to have had the opportunity to work with him on these and other important issues over the years, and my thoughts are with his family and all who knew and loved Congressman Coble. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Goodlatte. Thank you, Mr. Conyers. Pursuant

84 | to notice, I now call up...

Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman?

86 Chairman Goodlatte. What purpose does the gentlewoman 87 from Texas seek recognition?

88 Ms. Jackson Lee. Strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recognized.

Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman, might I add my tribute and appreciation for Congressman Coble, who I had the opportunity to serve from the very moment that I came on this august panel. He was gracious at all times. He had an amazing love for his work and his constituents, and certainly, he was a strong advocate for the protection of intellectual property, among many other issues. And so, I want to offer deepest sympathy to his family and to his former constituents, and to let them know how much of a contribution he made as an American, both on the House Judiciary Committee in the spirit of justice, but also, in the representation of his district. And I hope that he will rest in peace. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman. Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 3713 for purposes of mark-up and move that the committee report the bill favorably to the House. The clerk will report the bill.

Ms. Williams. H.R. 3713, to reform sentencing laws and for other purposes.

109	[The bill follows:]
110	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the bill is considered as read and open for amendment at any point. And I will begin by recognizing myself for an opening statement. The legislation the committee will consider today is the culmination of three years of work on over-criminalization and criminal justice reform. In the 113th Congress, I, along with Ranking Member Conyers, established an Over-Criminalization Task Force, which held nine hearings on a variety of topics, including over-criminalization, overfederalization, sentencing reform, prison reform, regulatory crime. Building upon the work of the task force, the ranking member and I launched a criminal justice reform initiative in June of this year. The first step in this initiative was a listening session in which any member of Congress was invited to address the Committee on Criminal Justice Reforms. Following the listening session, committee staff worked together in a bipartisan fashion to craft legislation that meets the goals of this initiative.

The first bill that we will consider today is H.R. 3713, the Sentencing Reform Act of 2014. I introduce this legislation, along with Ranking Member Conyers, Crime Subcommittee Ranking Member Jackson Lee, Representative Labrador, and a bipartisan group of leaders on this issue. This legislation strikes an important balance between

reducing certain federal mandatory sentencing laws, and ensuring that these sentencing laws continue to protect the American people from violent criminals.

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

H.R. 3713 makes several significant changes to federal sentencing law. It reduces the mandatory life sentence for a third drug trafficking offense to a mandatory sentence of 25 years, and reduces the second strike mandatory sentence from 20 to 15 years. H.R. 3713, in response to a recent court decision, amends federal fire arm statutes to clarify congressional intent that stacking of federal penalties requires an intervening arrest and conviction. It broadens the application of the existing safety valve to apply the benefit of sentencing without regard to the mandatory minimum to offenders with prior misdemeanor or non-violent felony convictions. The bill also creates a second, narrowly-tailored safety valve for certain offenders facing the 10-year mandatory sentence. Finally, the bill provides for limited retroactivity of the crack cocaine trafficking quantities in the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010. H.R. 3713 also makes the sentencing reductions proposed in the bill retroactive. However, it does not blindly apply retroactivity. The bill excludes from retroactivity any offender who has a prior conviction for a serious violent felony for which the offender served 13 months or more in prison. This means that those inmates will be required to

serve their full term of incarceration, and will not be released early. I believe this is a critically important feature of H.R. 3713.

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

3713 contends a sentencing enhancement for fentanyl. Our nation is currently in the midst of a heroin epidemic. Fentanyl, a narcotic pain medication, 80 to 100 times more potent than morphine, is often used as a cutting agent for heroin, or is sold disguised as heroin, and has led to a rash of deaths across the country. H.R. 3713 imposes a sentencing enhancement of up to five years for trafficking in heroine cut with fentanyl, or trafficking in fentanyl heroine. This represented as enhancement must run consecutively to the underlying sentence.

H.R. 3713 allows serious violent felony convictions to serve as the basis for a sentencing enhancement for federal drug trafficking. Current law only allows prior drug felony convictions to serve as the basis for a sentencing enhancement. As with the limitation on retroactivity, I believe this is an important change that will enable law enforcement to target the violent drug traffickers who threaten our communities. The Sentencing Reform proposes targeted, responsible sentencing reforms. It makes common sense changes to center federal drug sentences, while helping law enforcement keep violent offenders behind bars and saving tax payer dollars. I want to thank the gentleman

from Wisconsin, the chairman of our Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigation Subcommittee, who also chaired our taskforce on over-criminalization for working with myself and Ranking Member Conyers on this legislation, and for the more than two years' work that he has dedicated to this issue as well. I want to thank the ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. Jackson Lee, for her important input in all of these areas related to criminal justice reform, as we set out to adopt legislation that we can send to the floor. At this time, it is my pleasure to recognize and also thank the ranking member of the committee, Mr. Conyers, for his hard work and collaboration on this series of bills that we are offering today.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]

200 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

Mr. Conyers. Thank you, Chairman Goodlatte, members of H.R. 3713, the Sentencing Reform Act, the committee. responds to the growing recognition in our states, and now in Congress, that we must make meaningful reforms to various aspects of our criminal justice system, particularly with reference to mandatory minimum sentences. As with any policy, it is our responsibility in Congress to examine the facts, make adjustments from time to time. And the facts demand that we take action on this issue. We are all too familiar with the most glaring statistics frequently cited -- the United States is home to the five percent of the world's population, but has 25 percent of the world's prisoners. Our incarceration rate is four times higher than China's. The Department of Justice spends nearly one third of its budget on the federal prisons. And we know that extending incarceration beyond that which is appropriate actually increases recidivism. Therefore, adjustments to our sentencing laws are long overdue, and that is why, as the chairman has suggested, we need to approve this bill.

H.R. 3713 is an important reform measure that makes a number of improvements. First of all, it reduces mandatory minimum sentences for prior drug felons. It broadens the

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

existing safety valve, to allow more offenders to be sentenced below mandatory minimum drug sentences if, in the court's discretion, it is warranted. The bill creates an additional safety valve to allow relief for some offenders who would otherwise be subject to the 10-year mandatory minimum for drug offenses. In addition, H.R. 3713 reforms the way prior firearms offenses are considered, with respect to application of the mandatory minimum sentence for repeat firearm offenders. And most importantly, the retroactively applies the reduced mandatory minimum sentences for crack cocaine under the Fair Sentencing Act. And, notably, the bill does all of this without the addition of new mandatory minimum sentences the Senate proposed in similar legislation.

The changes will still allow for appropriate punishment, and in my view, would make us safer. They will also save American taxpayers money by reducing the spending associated with needlessly long incarceration; money that should be invested in education, job training, and other productive priorities. We, on this committee, have worked together as our constituents expect of us to find a way forward on this important issue, and the measure before us reflects the recognition that criminal law is a blunt instrument, and it is difficult to achieve just results in every case. So in my view, that is why we must allow

judges, who are in the best position to know and evaluate all of the circumstances of each case, to impose sentences hold offenses -- offenders that both appropriately accountable and that are just according to the facts. H.R. 3713 does not achieve all what I and some of my colleagues would want. However, today, we have the opportunity, on a bipartisan basis, to address some of these injustices and to provide retroactive relief for some of those who have been subjected to them. As this committee has done in the past when history has required it, it is my hope that we can and will come together today to take action on a pressing issue for our nation, so that we will send a bipartisan message that the House Judiciary Committee can adopt smart and common sense changes to the criminal sentences laws that will help thousands of individuals and their families while also enhancing public safety. I commend all of colleagues who have worked on this bill and urge immediate passage. I thank the chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Conyers follows:]

267 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

Mr. Sensenbrenner. Mr. Chairman.

268

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

269 Chairman Goodlatte. First, the gentleman from 270 Wisconsin seeks recognition.

Mr. Sensenbrenner. I move to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. Sensenbrenner. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Over the past several months, we have seen growing momentum for sentencing reform legislation and mounting evidence for why we need reform. Decades of flawed sentencing laws have swelled the ranks of nonviolent offenders in our federal The results have led to prison overcrowding, prisons. strapped budgets, and diminished wellbeing for current and former prisoners in the public at large. The Sentencing Reform Act is not perfect. Evidence-based programs in states like Texas and Utah have shown that we can reduce prison population and save taxpayers' dollars without increasing crime rates. I would have preferred legislation to adopt these proven approaches; however, I credit the chairman with finding a middle ground in working with members of both parties through each disagreement.

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

I think that, to thoroughly vet this and to get the proper balance, it is going to take several Congresses in order to see how these reforms work and whether they need to be tweaked, amended, enhanced, or reduced. And I look forward, for the next several Congresses, to working with my colleagues to achieve any amendments that we may need to make to this bill in the future. However, the Sentencing Reform Act will eliminate mandatory life sentences for three-time, nonviolent drug offenders, reducing mandatory minimum sentences to 25 years. Like the Safe Justice Act, which I introduced with Congress with Bobby Scott of Virginia, the Sentencing Reform Act will also narrow the kinds of prior drug offences that can trigger recidivist enhancements, broaden the safety valve, and make the Fair Sentencing Act retroactive.

Our system cannot continue on its present trajectory. It is not only fiscally unsustainable, but morally irresponsible. This is a much needed step forward today. However, I hope we all can agree that we can and we should do more. We must have the courage to tackle prison reform and to strengthen our probation and reentry program. We should promote the use of drug courts and veterans' treatment courts within the federal system, as well enhance treatment services for those who have mental health or substance abuse disorders. The states have been

outperforming Congress in criminal justice reform for years. It is my hope that we can continue to work together in a bipartisan manner to produce legislation that will address the complex problems our current system face. Now you will back the balance of my time.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. What purpose does the gentlewoman from Texas seeks recognition?

Ms. Jackson Lee. To strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized.

Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman, thank you so very much, and I want to offer my appreciation to the chairman, the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Conyers and Mr. Sensenbrenner, for having the common goal of turning the corner on criminal justice reform in this nation. Let me say that, today, we make a significant statement and take action on reducing and eliminating mass incarceration in this nation. We take leaps of faith to recognize the importance of restoration and rehabilitation. This is not a compromise or best effort. It is actually a reality of laws, provisions that will, in fact, be placed in the criminal justice system, giving attitudes to defense council and prosecutors to have a fair and even playing field for those nonviolent offenders who have come in the crosshairs

of the criminal justice system and need another opportunity.

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

It will be a lifeline for families who have waited for years for their love ones to be released, and no, it will not add to the crime of this country. In fact, it will give more tools to those who will be released to tool this country and make it a better place. So again, I extend my thanks to you and the ranking member, Conyers, who has a long history of justice issues in this Congress and in the nation. I thank you for the hard work and for the listening session that I willingly and participated in and supported, as well as the over-criminalization effort led by Mr. Sensenbrenner, the ranking member in the last session, and the many members on this committee, republicans and I want to thank you, particularly those who democrats. participated in the over-criminalization task force. work has been the embodiment of this legislation, and we thank you so very much for you work.

When we began this process, our desire was to form a consensus, not to overstep the values and the heartfelt positions of many on this committee. It was to work, step-by-step, to build a consensus, not something often seen over the years, and how befitting it is that a committee that has its hands around the justice system of America confined consensus on such a contentious issue and one that has hurt so many families across America. We began our task force

with the knowledge that truly meaningful reforms requires us to look at every piece of the system, from policing to charging and convicting, and from sentencing to the collateral consequences awaiting incarcerated individuals. We set our sights on comprehensive reform that tackles sentencing, prisons, over-criminalization, youth justice, civil asset forfeiture, reentry, policing, criminal procedures, and the most recent addition, mental illness.

And I am grateful that the chairman says we will tackle all of those issues. That is an important step. Each piece is critically necessary, but we knew that sentencing reform would truly test the seriousness of our commitment to collaboration. That is why we tackled it head on. As I sit here today, I know that we are not alone in knowing that we made the right choice in working with so many. With the Sentencing Reform Act of 2015, we unify to reject a system that is often more effective at creating criminals and collateral damage than actual justice.

Our legislation is strong and thoughtful. As explained by the chairman and ranking member and as shown by data, it will reduce mass incarceration. Over 11,500 individuals who are currently incarcerated will be eligible for retroactive relief. Over 4,000 more will benefit each year. Combined, that is over 15,000 in 10 years to be restored and rehabilitated. These estimates are conservative, and there

are ones we can move and base our future legislation on. It could be said that other bills, some that have come before and some that will surely follow, will do it differently or go further. But there is something about our legislation that is different, something that gives me hope for our entire reform system. Our bipartisan legislation can get to the president.

I ask my colleagues to reflect on this moment. Our current path is unsustainable. We know the numbers: less than 5 percent of the world's population, but 25 percent of the world's prisoners; ranked number one in incarceration. The cost of this system is incredibly high, \$80 billion. Worse, this system takes an incredible human toll with the cycle of incarceration. Those costs, including the costs of our greater sense of humanity, bring us to this moment. I call on my colleagues to support the Sentencing Reform Act of 2015, H.R. 3713, because these calls are simply too great to bear.

Such meaningful reforms would not be possible again without the collaborative work of our chairman and ranking member, Mr. Sensenbrenner and all of you who have been so dedicated to this issue. In my service as ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, Crime Subcommittee, I have been truly humbled to take on this task, one of the most important in my lifetime. Just as our action is one step

413 towards enacting this legislation, the bill is one component 414 of criminal justice reform. I look forward to our continued 415 collaboration on all of the other areas, especially helping 416 our youth and the youth justice system and prison reform. 417 The bipartisan legislation and the leadership here should 418 truly make a difference in the lives of so many. 419 Chairman, with that, I yield back. 420 Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman. 421 What purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin seek 422 recognition? 423 Mr. Sensenbrenner. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment 424 at the desk. 425 Chairman Goodlatte. The clerk will record the 426 amendment 427 Ms. Williams. Amendment to H.R. 3713 offered by Mr. 428 Sensenbrenner of Wisconsin. Add at the end of the bill. 429 [The amendment of Mr. Sensenbrenner follows:] 430 ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman Goodlatte. That objection to the amendment is considered as read, and the gentlemen is recognized for five minutes on his amendment.

Mr. Sensenbrenner. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My amendment does two things. First, it will require DOG, in consultation with the sentencing commission, to issue another report updating the commission's 2011 comprehensive report I mandatory minimums. Among other things, the report contains substantial information about the use of pleas, what offenses were dismissed as a part of the plea, sentencing enhancements, and what charges were dismissed. It is important that, when reforming our criminal justice

system, we need to have the most up-to-date information. Secondly, it expresses the sense of Congress that the growing and serious need to make mental health creep into the central component of criminal justice reform. More than half of federal inmates have symptoms of serious mental illness. Our jails and prisons have become America's mental health facilities, the purpose for which they were never intended. However, with proper treatment, which we know costs far less than imprisonment, offenders can be rehabilitated and safely transitioned back into the community. States have embraced this approach and so should Congress. I want to thank the ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. Jackson Lee, for co-sponsoring this amendment as well as the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Collins, and the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Richmond. I look forward to working with the chairman and ranking member on this critical component and urge my colleagues to support the amendment and yield back the balance of my time. Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlemen. What purpose does the gentleman from Michigan seek

Mr. Conyers. Strike the requisite number of words.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlemen is recognized for

467 | five minutes.

recognition?

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

466

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

Thank you, Conyers. sir. Members of the Mr. committee, obviously, I support the amendment, but I want to thank the Crime Subcommittee chairman, Jim Sensenbrenner, and the subcommittee ranking member, Sheila Jackson Lee and also members Doug Collins and Cedric Richmond for their recommendations of these proposals. We will benefit from the report from the sentencing commission on the use of mandatory minimum sentencing. It is also important that Congress recognize the need to better integrate mental health treatment as part of our reforms effort. And for those reasons, I urge the adoption of this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair recognizes himself in support of the amendment. I appreciate the amendment offered by the chairman of the crime subcommittee, Mr. Sensenbrenner, the ranking member of the crime subcommittee, Ms. Jackson Lee, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Collins, and the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Richmond. This amendment expresses the sense of Congress that meaningful criminal justice reform requires the integration of a mental health component as part of a comprehensive reform strategy. It also requires the justice department to issue a report on the mandatory minimum sentencing provisions in federal law.

As my colleagues are all aware, part of the committee's criminal justice reform initiative will include

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

consideration of legislation to reauthorize programs designed to treat and assist mentally ill offenders. agree with my colleagues that this is an important component of the criminal justice reform initiative. I look forward to working with the gentleman from Wisconsin, the general lady from Texas, the gentleman from Georgia, gentleman from Louisiana, along with other members of the committee to whom I know this is important as we move forward with this process. As to the reporting provision in 2011, the sentencing commission issued a comprehensive report on mandatory minimums. Given that this committee is legislation, changing moving some mandatory minimum sentences, the responsible thing for us to do is ensure that our actions are evaluated by the federal agency that enforces these laws. I support the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. What purpose does the gentlewoman from Louisiana seek? I'll get to the gentleman from Louisiana -- the gentlewoman from Texas seek recognition? Ms. Jackson Lee. That is all right. We are neighbors, Mr. Chairman. Thank you so very much, and I am going to

Ms. Jackson Lee. That is all right. We are neighbors,

Mr. Chairman. Thank you so very much, and I am going to

thank you, Mr. Conyers -- Mr. Sensenbrenner. I want to

thank him for leading on this amendment, and I am delighted

to be able to join him, along with Mr. Collins and my

neighbor, Mr. Richmond in Louisiana, all who have expressed

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

and often commented on the intervening factor of mental illness. know that law enforcement We spends amounts of time disproportionate interacting with individuals with mental illness, not because of criminal conduct, but other behavioral related to crisis that is viewed as problematic in a community. Every day, we are facing the various array of stories that provide us with a sad commentary on the confrontation of someone suffering from a mental illness, a mental health crisis, who comes in contact with law enforcement. We realize that this is, again, another scourge that we must address in a positive In fact, law enforcement have come in front of this way. very committee and expressed a desire for increasing mental health and social services over budgets for incarceration and policing.

Let me say I have had first-hand experience dealing with some of these issues in my own jurisdiction. Example of a young man who had a mental breakdown and was incarcerated in our local prison, local jail, and created an enormously difficult conditions for himself and rejecting all help from the jailers. Family was not able to see him because there was no mental health component in the jail, and I worked to get that system put in the jail and be able to deal with those who are even incarcerated already who have a mental health concern. So I am very pleased that

this amendment includes an order for the sentencing commission to conduct a study on mandatory minimums and their relationship to unwarranted sentencing disparities, and I am delighted that, in this bill, we will have a placeholder and an articulate statement on the vital-ness of understanding mental health crisis and how it interrelates to policing, criminal justice, and ultimately the incarceration. I thank my ranking member -- excuse me -- for his work, the chairman of the full committee and I particularly thank Mr. Sensenbrenner for his efforts. With that, I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman. What purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana seek recognition?

Mr. Richmond. I would like to speak in support of the amendment.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Richmond. First, I would like to thank Mr. Sensenbrenner for his hard work and the long track record of work that he has on criminal justice reform and introducing this amendment and thanking both the chairman and the ranking member for supporting the amendment. And I think that it does two things. One, it shows how much work we still have to do in getting to a point of comprehensive

criminal justice reform. Two, it highlights the fact that too much of our mental health services are happening in the prisons, as opposed to other facilities. And as states balance difficult budgets, mental health has been one of the things that was always on the chopping block. And we, in society, are paying for that dearly, and this amendment highlights that, but the other thing it does is reinforces the work we still have to do.

Under this bill, 50,000 non-violent drug offenders have the possibility to be released over the next 10 years. We released 650,000 ex-offenders every year from prison, and our recidivism rate is over 50 percent, so that means over half of them are going to wind up back in the system unless we spend effort, time, and commit resources to not only mental health, but those programs that will reduce recidivism.

So making sure that when people get out, they have stable housing. That they can find employment. That we can deal with mental health and that we can start to renew family relationships. Because one of the things we find is that, although the incarcerated person may actually be in the confines of a jail, but it is the family that is doing time. And we have to make sure that we continue to have those sort of connections, so that we can have support systems for people when they get out. Because the purpose

of the bill and the purpose of criminal justice reform, at the end of the day, is to make our communities safer and to help reform people who need reform.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to, again, support the amendment, because the data collection is also important, and the recommendations and the report on mandatory minimums. Because I think what is important here, and we should always stress, is that all the decisions are being made based on data and proven evidence, so that we are making scientific decisions in terms of how to keep the community safe and we are not just going off of what we think and what we believe. But we are using experts who deal with this every day, so that we can protect society.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I will thank the author of the amendment and I will thank the chairman and the ranking member, who I also have a long track record on criminal justice issues.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

All those in favor, say aye.

Those opposed, no.

The opinion of the chair is that the ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Are there any other amendments? What purpose does the

618	gentleman from Colorado seek recognition?
619	Mr. Buck. I have an amendment at the desk.
620	Chairman Goodlatte. The clerk will report the
621	amendment.
622	Ms. Williams. Amendment to H.R. 3713, offered by Mr.
623	Buck of Colorado. At the appropriate place.
624	[The amendment of Mr. Buck follows:]
625	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******
626	Chairman .Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment
627	will be considered as read and the gentleman is recognized

for five minutes on his amendment.

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

Mr. Buck. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment exempts heroin offenders from any provisions in this bill that would change current law. In other words, this amendment preserves the tools that prosecutors and police need to face the heroin epidemic in America. Heroin is a scourge on our country. In the past decade, heroin overdose deaths in America have increased four-fold. 8,200 people died from heroin use in 2013. Between 2002 and 2004, 379,000 people reported using heroin. Nearly a decade later, that number had grown to 663,000. Greater than half of the 120 people who die from drug overdoses every day in the U.S. are killed by heroin and painkillers. The drug has its grip on our youth. In the last decade, heroin use doubled in the 18- to 25-year-old age group. cartels, largely from Mexico, have unprecedented reach. 2005, only 228 pounds of the drug was seized on our southern In 2014, that number increased to 9,205 pounds. border. And that is only what we caught. This amendment leaves mandatory minimum sentences in place for heroin-related offenses. As a prosecutor, I can speak of the advantage of these minimum sentences. When a man, a big cog in the wheel of a big drug

When a man, a big cog in the wheel of a big drug organization is looking at 20 years of his life behind bars for selling heroin, he starts thinking straight. In return

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

for a lesser sentence, prosecutors can convince him to give up the kingpins, the ones whose hands are really red with the blood of thousands of American overdose deaths. young man pleads to a lesser sentence and hopefully rebuilds his life after a few years in prison. The kingpins face the justice they deserve, decades behind bars. I will point to comments from my honorable colleague, Mr. Rangel, from New York. Witnessing the toll that drugs took on families in his Harlem district decades ago, he argued for a tough stance on drug issues. He said, "We need outrage. I do not know what is behind the lackadaisical attitudes towards drugs, but I do know that the American people have made it abundantly clear. They are outraged by the indifference of the U.S. government to this problem." In decades since, we have not only been indifferent, but we cannot fall back into a lackadaisical attitude about a drug that ravages our communities as much as heroin.

I will close with a story I read in the Washington Post. It is about Morgan Brittain, a 19-year-old in Portland, Oregon. In May 2013, Brittain overdosed on a half a gram of black tar heroin. She spent four months in a coma. She survived the overdose, but the scars will last a lifetime. She cannot walk, cannot eat, cannot write, and has trouble speaking. Morgan is one of thousands of youth each year who face death and disability by heroin. To save

these lives, we need to dismantle the organizations that supply heroin. And to do that, our prosecutors and police need the tools currently in their toolkit, including mandatory minimums. With these tools, we can secure a better, safer future for our children.

Mr. Chairman, based on our previous conversations and the opportunity to improve this bill at a more appropriate time, I will withdraw this amendment. And I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the gentleman's amendment is withdrawn. The chair thanks the gentleman and looks forward to working with him on the issue. What purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina seek recognition?

Mr. Gowdy. I seek recognition.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Gowdy. Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend the gentleman from Colorado of, first of all, for his service to the State of Colorado as a prosecutor. And also to the United States government as an Assistant United States Attorney, for highlighting the heroin epidemic which, as the gentleman from Colorado knows, is actually a bipartisan issue. Our friend and colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, was also a prosecutor, and he

has spoken eloquently about the heroin epidemic. So I want nothing more than to commend my friend from Colorado for highlighting this issue and hope that he continues to do so. And with that, I would yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. What purpose does the gentleman from Georgia seek recognition?

Mr. Johnson. Move to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for this proposal that actually moves us towards a solution to the problem of mass incarceration that has afflicted our society since Richard Nixon declared war on drugs. And this mass incarceration has afflicted, disproportionately, just as the heroin epidemic of the 1970s, disproportionately affected people from inner-city neighborhoods. Black folks, we have borne the brunt of this mass incarceration, which this legislation seeks to change course. It is a modest proposal that I congratulate the chair of this committee, the ranking member of this committee, and also the chair and ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee of this committee.

But I do not want us to move backwards. Because of this scourge of heroin that is now afflicting suburban neighborhoods, it is now getting the attention that it

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

certainly deserves. But at the same time, we do not want to go back to mass incarceration for a public health problem. And I will point out, after having practiced criminal law for 27 years as a defense lawyer, that when street-level drug dealers are the ones who generally get caught up in these drug stings, and they are the ones who get sent to prison, they do not know who the big kingpins are. And whenever you do find out who a kingpin is, it is the kingpin that has the leverage to negotiate a good deal with the prosecutor. They end up being able to keep all of their property, being able to get their time cut, so long as they can testify about everybody down line. They can deliver more bodies to the prosecution to lock up, thus feeding the mass incarceration. So with that said, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman.

What purpose does the gentleman from Texas seek recognition?

Mr. Gohmert. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Move to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Gohmert. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know you have worked very hard to get input from all of us. We have got a letter here, dated November 16, from Steven Cook of the National Association of Assistant U.S. Attorneys. As their

president, he expresses concerns about our bill. And their opinion is that the nation will suffer higher crime rates, higher taxpayer costs, greater human turmoil, and disparate justice throughout the federal courts, and urge us not to pass this. But I felt like the AUSAs that are enforcing the law should have their voices heard and would ask unanimous consent to submit this as part of the record.

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, that letter will be made a part of the record.

Mr. Gohmert. Then I would yield back. Thank you.

Chairman Goodlatte. I just want to note, for the record, that during the Over-Criminalization Task Force hearing on penalties, we did hear from Mr. Eric Evenson, who appeared on behalf of the National Association of Assistant U.S. Attorneys. And we will continue to work closely with them and other interested groups, as we continue with this process. We have been in contact with them and I have met with them individually as well, and I know other members have as well. So we definitely welcome their input into this process. And they have been heard.

Mr. Buck. Very good.

Chairman Goodlatte. Are there further amendments?
What purpose does the gentlewoman from Texas seek recognition?

777 Ms. Jackson Lee. Strike the last word. Let me

recognize the gentleman from Colorado for his concern and thank him for his concern. Certainly, this is re-raging again. My good friend from Georgia has delineated the siege that we found ourselves in in urban neighborhoods. Many of us grew up in those same neighborhoods and saw this right in our reach. And so we are not unfamiliar with heroin and its devastation. The statement that is being made by this legislation is, by no means, ignoring the scourge of any drug. What it is saying is that we are giving other tools to be able to restore people who have served more time for an approach to drugs that we have found that has not been the most direct in solving the problem.

I think we have to look at heroin. We have to come with, again, additional tools. But we know many of this is engaged in mental health issues. My state, Texas, has been a leader on trying to craft a pathway for reduction of incarceration, eliminating a mass incarceration, but still keeping citizens in the State of Texas safe. And we have been successful and I want to congratulate them. So I know the work that Congressman Rangel did. He was on the Select Committee on Narcotics. At that time, heroin was in this siege, as it is seemingly becoming now. And he was asking the nation to take notice of how do we stop the heroin from coming into neighborhoods that he represented. I know the story very well.

803 And so I think we can find a pathway and I think that 804 pathway can work very well, keeping the sentiment and the 805 basis of H.R. 3713, which also brings about the release or 806 the coming down of mass incarceration without diminishing 807 the safety and security of the American people. So I thank 808 the gentleman for his comments and I know that we will look 809 forward to working with him. I yield back. 810 Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. 811 Are there any other amendments to H.R. 3713? What purpose 812 does the gentleman from Colorado seek recognition? 813 Mr. Buck. I have an amendment at the desk. 814 Chairman Goodlatte. The clerk will report the 815 amendment. 816 Ms. Williams. Amendment to H.R. 3713, offered by Mr. 817 Buck of Colorado. At the appropriate place. 818 [The amendment of Mr. Buck follows.] ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ****** 819

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read and the gentleman is recognized for five minutes on his amendment.

Mr. Buck. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will call on the Attorney General to publish the name of every offender whose sentence is reduced retroactively through this bill, those offenders' criminal histories, and a notification if an individual released due to the provisions of this bill is arrested or charged with a crime. The lawmaking process should not end when a bill is passed. We have a responsibility to make sure our laws actually work.

The bill we are considering will result in the early release of many prisoners. My amendment measures the consequences of this bill, to help us understand how reduced sentences affect recidivism. The amendment will help us better understand the risk factors that lead an offender to commit further crimes, helping us to improve our nation's criminal justice system. Requiring this transparency is

vital, because many of the crimes in our country are committed by re-offenders.

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

In a massive Bureau of Justice statistics study across 30 states, 76.6 percent of released prisoners were arrested again within five years. These statistics hold across different types of offenses. Violent, property, drug, and public order. In fact, 77 percent of drug offenders were arrested within five years of release, compared to only 71 percent of violent offenders. As we consider who should serve shorter versus longer sentences, we need to be sure we are not releasing criminals back on to the street to commit the same or worse crime. Transparency and careful legislating are especially important at a time like this. In a speech last month, FBI Director James Comey stated, "More people are being killed in America's cities this year than in many years. And let's be clear. Far more people of color are being killed in America's cities this year. it is not the cops doing the killing." He continued, "Most of America's 50 largest cities have seen an increase in homicides and shooting this year. And many of them have seen a huge increase."

Crime may be spiking this year, but we have felt the effects of crime, and more specifically, recidivism, for a long time. My State of Colorado especially knows the consequences of repeat offenders. Since 2002, at least 33

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

088

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

former prisoners on parole were accused of 38 murders. of those was the cold-blooded assassination of Tom Clements, the Executive Director of the Department of Corrections. Other released prisoners in Colorado threatened to go on mass shooting sprees or bomb a high school in Denver. Our lesson from these grim statistics? Crime directly impacts the American people. With sky-high recidivism rates and increasing violent crime across the United States, we owe it to our constituents to take great care with policies that would put future criminals back on the street. My amendment will allow us to take great care and would add transparency to the process. And Mr. Chairman, again, I will withdraw this amendment, given our conversations, and thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this bill. And understand that we will continue to look at different ways to improve this legislation. I yield back my time.

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn and the chair thanks the gentleman. And what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana seek recognition?

Mr. Richmond. Strike the last word. Very quickly.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. Richmond. Just in case the gentleman from Colorado is pursuing that line, I would just offer to work with him.

Because even if you look at the movement now to ban the box and have employers not look at criminal history until after

they have made a decision whether they are interested in a candidate, I understand exactly what you are trying to do and I think there is some value to it. But I am also concerned that it would defeat the process in terms of banning the box. So if we can work together and see if there is some common ground, I would love to do that. I am worried about making it a self-fulfilling prophecy. So that when someone gets out and everyone knows he is an exoffender, if he cannot legally get a job and provide for his family, then it pushes him either into a state of depression and hopelessness, or it pushes him back into a life of crime. So maybe we can find some middle area there. And I am just speaking from my experience with helping exoffenders. So I am willing to work with you is the short answer to all of that I just said.

Mr. Buck. Thank you.

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

Mr. Richmond. And with that I will yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman and would also be willing to work with both gentlemen on that issue. What purpose does the gentlewoman from California seek recognition?

Ms. Bass. I would also like to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for five minutes.

912 Ms. Bass. Thank you. And express my interest in

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

working with the gentlemen as well. One of things that we have certainly seen in California, where the courts required us to reduce the number of inmates, because our prisons were too overcrowded, is that we let people back on the street. But over the years, we had passed over 50 bans on various occupations. For example, one was barbering. program in our state prisons to teach people how to barber, but then we would not let them have a license. And so we have to figure out how to reintegrate people back into society. Or it actually has the opposite effect in a lot of neighborhoods. It increases crime. Because of people cannot work in the legal economy, they will sure enough work in the illegal economy. So I look forward to working with the gentlemen as well, to help get people back reintegrated into society.

But Mr. Chair, I wanted to commend you and the Ranking Member and the Crime Subcommittee ranking member, Jackson Lee, for their work on this bill. H.R. 3713 is an important step in the right direction on criminal justice reform. But there is a lot of room for improvement in this bill. And more broadly, there is a lot of room for improvement in the conversations we are having about criminal justice reform. Regarding this bill, I was prepared to offer an amendment that would narrowly define conspiracy and relevant conduct under the drug code, so that people are sentenced for what

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

they knowingly and willingly do. The reason we should add such a provision is that, too often, young women get caught up with the wrong guys, basically. Where they are not intentionally involved in drug dealing but the men are involved in drug dealing. And they either inadvertently get involved in the drug operations, or they are physically or emotionally abused and coerced into being involved. So when the police make a raid, they are detained, charged, and sentenced as co-conspirators. And I wanted to cite one case of a young woman named Danielle Metz from New Orleans from my colleague next to me in his district. She was in an abusive relationship with a drug dealer who physically beat her and rarely let her leave the house. She was afraid to leave him because he was violent, but she also felt quilty about separating him from their two young children. twice, he made her pick up and transfer cash related to his drug enterprise, and she got indicted as a co-conspirator. She is now thousands of miles away from her family, actually, in my state, serving the 22nd year of a life sentence. She was not a trafficker or a kingpin. She was a young woman stuck in a bad situation. Yet due to mandatory minimums, the court convicted her for handling drug money, which she did out of fear for her life. Despite being a first time nonviolent offender, Danielle was sentenced to life in prison. The amendment I was prepared to offer would

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

ensure that a person like Danielle cannot be convicted of conspiracy. She would have to intentionally have participated to be charged and sentenced. So that is one area of the bill that I wanted to improve, and I am not going to offer the amendment.

But I wanted to give another example talking about criminal justice more broadly. I bet many of my colleagues are not aware that incarcerated women are chained down while giving birth, despite the fact that this practice is inhumane and opposed by medical professionals. In Illinois, 80 inmates won a \$4.1 million class action suit for being shackled while pregnant or in labor. In Nevada, the State Board of Examiners paid \$150,000 to an inmate who suffered bone separation because she was shackled during labor. fact, federal courts have condemned such shackling as an Eighth Amendment violation. In 2009, 8th Circuit Court, Nelson v. Correctional Medical Services, the court said that shackling a pregnant prisoner during labor was clearly a violation of the Eighth Amendment. A federal case out of Tennessee held that shackling of a pregnant detainee in the final stages of labor shortly before birth and during postpartum recovery violates the Eighth Amendment. Again, I think that there is many areas in our criminal justice system that we need to look at. This is clearly one. Ι realize it is outside the scope of the bill, but I did want

to raise this in hopes that the chairman and the ranking member will continue our dialogue around criminal justice reform once we dispense with this legislation today. And I yield back my time.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman. Are there any further amendments to H.R. 3713? A reporting quorum being present, the question is on the motion report the bill. What purpose does the gentleman from New York seek recognition?

Mr. Nadler. Sir, if I could get the last word, please.

Chairman Goodlatte. Gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Nadler. Thank you. Mr. Chairman -- first of all, before I say what I had prepared to say, I just want to comment that the story just told to us by the gentlelady from California of that young woman sentenced to life imprisonment because she was involved with her boyfriend, her abusive boyfriend, and got a mandatory minimum of life, is exactly why what Mr. Buck said earlier is wrong. She got a mandatory minimum because she did not know a kingpin to give up, and these mandatory minimums often have the perverse result of a kingpin who knows other kingpins getting a light sentence, and the guy low on the totem pole who did not do that much, having nobody to give up, having no leverage in the plea bargaining, and therefore getting a

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

terrible sentence, or even someone innocent, who, facing a huge sentence and a huge legal expense, and not having a lot of money, they plead to a lower case to avoid the mandatory minimum even though they are innocent. So there are real problems here that we have to address.

Now, sentencing reform is critically important, and I appreciate the chairman, Mr. Goodlatte, and the ranking member, Mr. Conyers, and Crime Subcommittee ranking member, Chairman Sensenbrenner, Ranking Member Jackson Lee for their work on this, and I will support the bill because it makes some improvements to the current law. But I should note my vote is with considerable hesitation. that am concerned that some of the enhancements of sentencing in the bill, while we are assured that they only go so far, and they only affect a small number of people, it is not clear that that is true. I am concerned that we do not know the effects, and the magnitude of the effect of some of the changes this bill would make, particularly with respect to heroin and fentanyl, and we run some risk that we could go in the opposite direction in some ways. So I wish we had more research and more data before we voted on this.

The new consecutive sentencing enhancement, as I said for heroin mixed with fentanyl, could send yet more people, particularly African-Americans to prison preventing sentences. We do not know how judges will apply this

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

provision, and because although we are told there are only eight or nine such cases that we know about with fentanyl, since fentanyl mixed with heroin has not been an aggravating cause, it may be that many people were sentenced for heroin where there was also fentanyl, and when we make it an aggravating cause, we will find that this provision has a much further effect than we believe now.

And so this bill makes a start in the right direction. I will support it. It does not go nearly far enough. equally importantly, for not going far enough, that is never a reason to vote against a bill. But I should not say never. It is rarely a reason to vote against a bill, that it makes an improvement, but not a big enough improvement. But there is some risk that this bill could actually go backwards. I do not really believe that, but I wish we had more research to indicate the scope of some of the new provisions we are putting in. With those reservations, I will vote -- I will support the bill. And in the hope that we know that this is not the solution to the problem, but the first step in the direction we have to go, because we have to go a lot farther than this. I thank you. I yield back.

1060 Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks gentleman. Are
1061 there further amendments to H.R. 3713? A reporting quorum
1062 being present, the question on the motion report the bill

1063 H.R. 3713 favorably to the house as amended. 1064 Those in favor will say aye. 1065 Those opposed, no. 1066 The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered reported 1067 favorably. Members will have two days to submit views. 1068 Without objection, the bill will report as 1069 amendment in the nature of a substitute incorporating all 1070 adopted amendments, and staff is authorized to make 1071 technical and conforming changes. Pursuant to notice, I now 1072 call up H.R. 4002 for purposes of markup, and move that the 1073 community report the bill favorably to the House. The clerk 1074 will report the bill. 1075 Ms. Williams. H.R. 4002, to amend title 18, United 1076 States Code, to make various improvements in various 1077 criminal law and for other purposes. 1078 [The bill follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

1079

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the bill is considered as read, and open for amendment at any point, and I will begin by recognizing myself for an opening statement. Today, we consider H.R. 4002, the criminal code improvement act of 2015, introduced by Congressman Jim Sensenbrenner, the chairman of both the Crime Subcommittee and the committee's Over-Criminalization Task Force in the last Congress. At the Task Force's first hearing, the witness panel unanimously agreed that the erosion of the mens rea requirement in federal criminal law was the most pressing

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

issue facing the Task Force. Indeed, during the remaining nine hearings held before the Task Force, we heard time and again about the problem with inadequate criminal intent requirements. This erosion, along with the expansion of the Federal Code to nearly 5,000 criminal statutes today, as well as hundreds of thousands of regulations carrying criminal penalties, has resulted in a code that no average American citizen could be expected to read and understand, let alone conform his conduct to. As a result, the news is replete with stories of Americans who have been convicted of crimes, and sometimes sentenced to prison terms, when they had no intent to break the law.

Of course, one of the main problems that led to this predicament is Congress itself. Recent Congresses have crafted scores of new federal criminal laws that lack adequate criminal intent requirements, and define the criminalization conduct in unacceptably vague, overbroad However, we have already taken important steps to terms. fix this problem. Earlier this year, at my direction, the Judiciary Committee sought and received a change to its rule jurisdiction. This change, which adds the "criminalization" to our jurisdiction, will ensure that this committee will be able to receive a sequential referral whenever a bill amends the conduct associated with a criminal offense, not just the penalty. H.R. 4002 takes the

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

next big step in this process. It makes a number of important changes to title 18 of the U.S. code. Most notably, it established a default mens rea standard of "knowingly," which will apply in cases where federal criminal law, including longstanding statutory law established case law, does not provide a state of requirement for the particular offense. H.R. 4002 also provides that in situations where a reasonable person in the same or similar circumstances would not know or would not have reason to believe that his conduct was unlawful, the government must prove that the defendant knew or had reason to believe the conduct was unlawful. This provision will address the problem of inadequate criminal intent requirements in crimes created by agency regulation, or malum prohibitum crimes.

This is a very carefully crafted bill. Its intent is not to impose a "knowingly" requirement for every element of every statute. Its intent is to impose a mens rea provision where none currently exists, to protect American citizens who did not know or have reason to know that they were violating federal law, and to curb strict liability criminalization. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his work on the task force, and encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]

1140 ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ****** 1141 Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman. 1142 Chairman Goodlatte. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan seek recognition? 1143 1144 Mr. Conyers. Strike the requisite number of words. 1145 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Michigan is 1146 recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Conyers. Thank you. Members of the committee,

1147

1148

1149

1150

1151

1152

1153

1154

1155

1156

1157

1158

1159

1160

1161

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172

H.R. 4402, the Criminal Code Improvement Act, was introduced to follow up on the work accomplished in the last congress by the committee's Task Force on Over-Criminalization and Over-federalization. The Task Force had hearings on a number of problems with federal criminal law, including issues of fairness and due process raised by imposing criminal sanctions, and the consequences of a criminal record on individuals convicted of offenses that do not have an intent requirement. To address these matters, the most notable change to the law made by H.R. 4002 is the creation of a default criminal intent, or mens rea requirement for offenses, where no state of mind is required by law. apply to offenses where both default rule would the underlying statute, including regulations implementing the statute, and the case law interpreting the statute, do not have a criminal intent requirement. In these instances, the bill would establish a known criminal intent requirement for In cases where a reasonable person in similar these laws. circumstances would not know or have reason to know that conduct is unlawful, the bill would further require proof that the defendant knew or had reason to believe that their conduct was unlawful. Such strict liability laws generally design to provide corporate accountability for harm such as damage to the environment or food safety, are often misdemeanors providing for fines of less than one year of

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1178

1179

1180

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

1190

1191

1192

1193

1194

1195

1196

1197

imprisonment as the maximum penalty. On the one hand, the prospect of a criminal record, even if a misdemeanor may provide sufficient incentive for corporate actors to comply with regulations protecting the public. On the other hand, we should be careful not to impose criminal liability inappropriately in some cases. Overall, the intent of the bill is to disrupt as little as possible current law, and to apply only to a narrow range of offenses completely lacking in an intent requirement.

Now, I appreciate that many of my friends in the public interest and criminal enforcement communities strongly believe that the bill before us goes too far in insulating those responsible for misconduct, and urge that narrowed to adequately protect public safety. Among other things, they have raised concerns about the bill's scope and about its retrospective application to laws already in place, and about creating new standards of our criminal law, and I am sensitive to these concerns and hope that we would review them as we move forward. We have some discussion going on with the Center for American Progress, as well as the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, and so I managed to keep these ideas under our review, and I thank the chairman, and yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin for his opening

1198 | statement.

Mr. Sensenbrenner. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the

1200 last word.

1202

1203

1204

1205

1206

1207

1201 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. Sensenbrenner. Mr. Chairman, thank you. During the 113th Congress, I chaired the Over-Criminalization Task Force. Its mandate was to conduct a comprehensive review of the over-criminalization in the federal criminal justice system. The Task Force held 10 hearings on a wide variety of topics from regulatory crime through penalties to over-

1208

1209

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

federalization. Two topics that permeated the issues facing the task force were the lack of consistent adequate criminal intent requirements, the need for criminal code reform to address the unwieldy and ever-growing federal criminal code. H.R. 4002, the legislation I authored following the conclusion of the Task Force's work, addresses those issues. Most notably, it creates a default mens rea standard for federal criminal laws which will apply in the limited situation where federal law does not provide an intent requirement.

In the last several sessions of Congress, I have sponsored legislation to rewrite the entire Federal Criminal Code, and I am pleased to continue that project in this That legislation, just as H.R. 4002 does, legislation. would bring uniformity to the code by using the term "knowingly" to define the requisite intent for every crime except for those criminal offenses that require some additional and more specific intent. H.R. 4002 а significant step toward meaningful criminal code reform. common criticism of the expansion of the Federal Criminal Code is that it has included an erosion of the mens rea requirement. This has not occurred, generally speaking, in historically common law criminal offenses, particularly malum in se offenses like murder, arson, or rape. That problem is most acute in the so-called malum prohibitum

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

1246

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251

1252

1253

1254

1255

1256

1257

offenses, that is, offenses that are crimes merely because congress has decided to pass a law saying so. Many of these offenses are created by unaccountable, unelected bureaucrats in federal regulatory agencies rather than in congressional committees with expertise in criminal law. As a result, far too often they have no guilty mind requirement, which means that American citizens can be convicted of crimes, and sometimes serve jail time, for unwittingly committed crimes such as failing to file paperwork, or fishing without a license. Vague definitions of these mala prohibita laws and other poorly drafted laws ensnare otherwise law-abiding American citizens who did not intend to break the law, and who believe in good faith that their conduct was lawful. This is an unacceptable state of affairs, and surely not what Congress or America's common law system intended. 4002 is intended to fix that problem.

In addition to the mens rea provision, H.R. 4002 makes several common senses changes to modernize, and reorganize, and streamline chapter 1 of title 18, including the inclusion of universal definitions for commonly used terms. As Justice Robert Jackson explained some 60 years ago, quote, "The contention that an injury can amount to a crime only when inflicted by intention, there is no provincial or transient notion. It is universal and persistent in mature system's law [spelled phonetically] as belief in freedom of

1258	the human will, and the consequent ability and duty of the
1259	normal individual to choose between good and evil." I urge
1260	my colleagues to support this important historic
1261	legislation, and yield back the balance of my time.

1262 [The prepared statement of Mr. Sensenbrenner follows:]

1263 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

1264 Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman.

1265 What purpose does the gentlewoman from Texas seek

1266 recognition?

1267 Ms. Jackson Lee. I thank the gentleman. I would like

1268 to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentlewoman is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Jackson Lee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me just very quickly, before I begin on this, to indicate to the gentleman from New York and the gentlewoman from California that, as we begin to move forward on all of these bills, we will take the concerns. But it is important to note that 3713, our bill on sentencing, only applies to offenders facing mandatory minimums, and this comparison illustrates the terms in this bill are substantially narrower than existing law. It makes a difference, and I look forward to working with them, particularly Ms. Bass, on the issues of conspiracy, and certainly how pregnant women are treated. I think it is important to note that we have made a strong effort going forward, and I look forward to working with them on their concerns.

As it relates to the underlying bill that is now before us, I want to again thank Mr. Conyers and the chairman and the subcommittee chairs for their work on this concern of mens rea in the Criminal Code Improvement Act of 2015. What it lacks in quantitative impact, however, it makes up with principle, principle that has deep roots within our system. And as we look at those who are supporting this legislation and those who raised concerns, we will have an opportunity

1293

1294

1295

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

1304

1305

1306

1307

1308

1309

1310

1311

1312

1313

1314

1315

1316

1317

to continue to work with you, the Citizens for American Progress, and certainly the American Bar Association. we realize that we had to do something, where many of these particular offenses had no knowing of mens rea, and had innocent people actually incarcerated based upon an action they did not know at that time might have been The vast majority of criminal offenses contain, criminal. contain, criminal are interpreted to the intent requirement, but offenses that do not can put law-abiding individuals at risk of prosecution. This legislation offers a narrow and measured response to this problem. The rule will directly impact strict liability misdemeanors that have been, and have been used against conduct that was particularly egregious, and conduct that was innocent or well-intentioned. The FDA has used this strict liability offense against egg producers who knew and took active steps to hide the fact that their eggs were contaminated and other violations of regulations. That is egregious behavior, and we think that that is a positive way to impact the American public.

The FDA also uses this strict liability offense to punish farmers who received a superior rating by a third-party auditor and had no reason to believe they were doing anything wrong, clearly non-culpable behavior. In both cases, the food product caused substantial harm, but because

1318

1319

1320

1321

1322

1323

1324

1325

1326

1327

1328

1329

1330

1331

1332

1333

1334

1335

1336

1337

1338

the offense does not require intent, the farmers prosecuted for the same offense as the egg producers. The farmers' culpability, blameworthiness, and knowledge was irrelevant under the law. So, it is important that, as we look at this legislation, we realize that it is going to help persons who are in benign circumstances, but are held to a strict liability. Although the farmers received sentences of probation, the egg producers received short prison sentences, that the wildly divergent constitute the same criminal offense and could be punished the same, speaks to the flawed nature of this strict liability standard. believe that as we make a first step with this legislation, we have the opportunity to continue to work and make it The default rule proposed in this bill would better. differentiate between these individuals. That said, some have raised concerns that rule would make it too hard to prosecute blameworthy individuals and negatively impact deterrents among others. I take these concerns seriously, and raise them we develop the legislation. as legislation, as introduced, is a combination of recognizing our concerns, and I am glad of that. I want to commend the chairman and the bill sponsor for

I want to commend the chairman and the bill sponsor for listening to these concerns and working with us to revise this important bill. I want to add my appreciation to the staff that have worked collectively on all of these bills,

and, of course, have taken the concerns of members and continued in ongoing negotiation. The principle behind this reform is truly worthwhile. Individuals who intend to comply with the law, and have no reason to believe their conduct is unlawful, should not be subject to criminal punishment. I appreciate that some concerns persist, and I look forward to examining them with my colleagues in a spirit of consensus and collaboration as we move forward in the legislative process. I think the work we have done on this speaks to a question of justice, which is the role of this particular committee, and I am very glad that we are moving forward for improving justice in this nation. I yield back.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman. What purpose does the gentleman from Texas to seek recognition?

Mr. Poe. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Poe. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As a former prosecutor, judge, as many of you here are, the issue has always been guilty mind. The basis of our criminal law is that there must be guilty intent, guilty mind, mens rea. We have, in my opinion, way too many federal offenses that do not require guilty mind. That surprises me because guilty

1368 basis of American criminal mind, is the mens rea, 1369 jurisprudence. Some in the Justice Department, the District 1370 Attorneys Associations, are concerned about the unintended 1371 consequences; I understand those concerns. It is ironic to 1372 me that the unintended consequences might be really the 1373 intended consequences, which should be if you commit a crime 1374 in this country and it is a federal offense, generally 1375 speaking, except for statutory strict liability cases, 1376 generally speaking, you should have intent, criminal intent, 1377 guilty mind. And I hope that is the intended consequence of 1378 this legislation, so I commend the chairman for this piece 1379 of legislation where the Federal Government needs to get out 1380 of the business of prosecuting people with no criminal 1381 intent. And I yield back. 1382 Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. 1383 Are there any amendments to H.R. 4002? What purpose does 1384 the gentleman from Georgia to seek recognition? 1385 Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an 1386 amendment at the desk. 1387 The clerk Chairman Goodlatte. will report the 1388 amendment. Ms. Williams. 1389 The amendment to H.R. 4002 offered by 1390 Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Page 15, strike the line... 1391 [The amendment offered by Mr. Johnson follows.]

1392 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

1395

1396

1397

1398

1399

1400

1401

1402

1403

1404

1405

1406

1407

1408

1409

1410

1411

1412

1413

1414

1393 Mr. Johnson. And I ask that it be considered as 1394 read.

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the memo is considered as read, and the gentleman is recognized for five minutes, on his amendment.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Subchapter C of the Criminal Code Improvement Act creates a default criminal intent on mens rea requirement for offenses where no state of mind is required by law. While the majority of criminal statutes contain a mental state requirement, usually knowingly or willfully, public welfare statutes do not contain this requirement to insure the broadest protection of the public or environment. For over a century, these statutory offenses, which are misdemeanor offenses punishable by civil fines or less than one year of imprisonment, have placed the burden of compliance on those who are in the best position to insure safe products and activities, rather than the public, which is endangered by unsafe products and activities in the marketplace. Α Supreme Court, or the Supreme Court has upheld the validity strict liability misdemeanor offenses for nearly a century. In 1909, the Court held that a corporation may be

held liable for the actions of its employees. In 1943, the Court expanded this doctrine to hold that responsible corporate officers may also be held liable under public welfare statutes. In 1975, the Court again affirmed the responsible corporate officer doctrine, and held that while demanding this doctrine was no more stringent than the public has a right to expect of those who voluntarily assume positions of authority in business enterprises, whose services and products affect the health and wellbeing of the public that supports them. This bedrock legal framework continues to define the relationship between corporations and public safety.

And as the white collar defense bar has acknowledged, although this enforcement tool is potentially far-reaching, it is typically reserved for the most rare and egregious cases. For example, this doctrine was applied under the Food Drug and Cosmetic Act to hold corporate officers accountable for the salmonella peanut outbreak of 2008, the largest outbreak of food-borne illness in U.S. history, as well as for the sale of an untold number of eggs contaminated with salmonella that resulted in thousands of severe illnesses. In sentencing the corporate officers in this latter case, the federal judge observed that not only would strict liability protect the public from additional crimes that the defendants may commit in their individual

1440

1441

1442

1443

1444

1445

1446

1447

1448

1449

1450

1451

1452

1453

1454

1455

1456

1457

1458

1459

1460

1461

1462

1463

1464

capacities, it would also serve to effectively deter against the marketing of unsafe foods and widespread harm to public health by similarly situated corporate officials and other executives in the industry -- so, in other words, general In other words, we have laws on the books deterrents. passed by Congress, used by prosecutors in only egregious cases, and repeatedly upheld by the courts, that are critical enforcement tools for insuring the public's health and safety. These laws have nothing to do with so-called regulatory crimes addressed today. By establishing a default rule for federal criminal offenses that currently lack a mental state requirement, however, the Criminal Code Improvement Act would eliminate strict liability misdemeanor offenses, including food, drug, and wildlife protection laws among others, and instead require that prosecutors demonstrate that the defendant had knowledge of the facts, giving rise to the offense, and in certain cases, knowledge of its unlawfulness.

Additionally, by establishing a variable mental state requirement for these offenses, not only would this bill undermine the responsible corporate officer doctrine, it would also depart from centuries of jurisprudence firmly establishing that ignorance of the law is not a defense to jeopardizing the public's health and safety. Notwithstanding these serious concerns, I appreciate that we

1465

1466

1467

1468

1469

1470

1471

1472

1473

1474

1475

1476

1477

1478

1479

1480

1481

1482

1483

1484

1485

1486

1487

1488

1489

are working to pass bipartisan legislation that is the first in ending policies that have resulted in step mass incarceration. I further recognize that the chair has made many good faith efforts to address concerns with the default mens rea language in H.R. 4002, and as with all compromise legislation, there may always be some concerns unaddressed. But it is my understanding that the chair will continue to work across party lines to ensure that some of our nation's most important federal welfare laws are not inadvertently disturbed by this bill. And with that understanding in mind, I will withdraw this amendment.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn. Are there other amendments to H.R. 4002? What purpose does the gentleman from Texas seeking recognition?

Mr. Gohmert. I would like to strike the last word.

Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Gohmert. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And it is good that we are taking this up. This has resulted in people who intended no legal violations, knew of no legal violations, and yet ended up going to jail or prison and the unintended consequences, as that term has been used, of putting people in prison who should not have been there in the first place. When you couple that kind of strict liability without mens

1490

1491

1492

1493

1494

1495

1496

1497

1498

1499

1500

1501

1502

1503

1504

1505

1506

1507

1508

1509

1510

1511

1512

1513

1514

rea or guilty intention with the laws that also need to be cleaned up that have allowed bureaucrats in cubicles and executive office buildings to come up with regulations that law-including criminal been given a couple of violations, you have a catastrophe. Strict liability for violating a regulation -- some bonehead in a cubicle has put together and the public does not even know about. So, this is a step in the right direction to correcting the wrongs that government has created and our government specifically, it just should not be. Work on this began back in 2007, and I want to specifically thank Ed Meese for the role that he played, contacting me at that time as the ranking member on the Crime Terrorism Homeland Security Subcommittee of this Committee, and the work that between the Heritage Foundation and the ACLU, as impractical as that might seem, and the work of many organizations, many groups, in trying to get something done on these issues. So, I am very grateful to the chairman for bringing this issue to the front. we can do something about regulations that Congress never would have intended to carry prison sentences for violating. I hope we can do something on that. But in the meantime, this is a good start, and I thank those involved in making this happen. I look forward to voting for it. Thank you. Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman. the gentleman for his work Thanks to on the Over-

1515	Criminalization Task Force as well. Are there any
1516	amendments to H.R. 4002? I report a quorum being present.
1517	The question is on the motion to report the bill H.R.
1518	4002 favorably to the House.
1519	Those in favor will say aye.
1520	Those opposed, no.
1521	The ayes have it.
1522	The bill is ordered reported favorably. Members will
1523	have two days to submit views. Pursuant to notice, I now
1524	call up H.R. 4001 for purposes of the markup, and move that
1525	the committee report the bill favorably to the House. The
1526	clerk will report the bill.
1527	Ms. Williams. H.R. 4001, to make technical amendments
1528	to title 18 of the United States Code based on the Law
1529	Revision Counsel's footnotes in that title.
1530	[The bill follows:]
1531	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the bill is considered as read and open for amendment at any point. I will begin by submitting my opening statement for the record in support of the bill, and recognize the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Buck, to explain his legislation.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]

1538 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

1532

1533

1534

1535

1536

1537

Mr. Buck. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am proud to introduce the Fix the Footnotes Act of 2015. Americans expect our criminal code to be just and fair. The threat of justice is our greatest weapon, a sword in the war against criminality. But sometimes, swords need sharpening and sometimes our criminal code needs refining. This bill makes technical changes to the criminal code. When Americans' liberty is at stake, each and every detail in federal statutes is important and deserves our utmost attention. For two decades, we have gone without a bill like this, so the time is right to fix past mistakes and clean up our ever-growing criminal code. I am proud that this bill continues the work being done by the Over-Criminalization Task Force. This bill will insure that Congress' intent and the criminal code is clear, and that the code is streamlined and appropriately drafted. I urge a yes vote on this bill and I yield back my time. Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman.

Ι

1539

1540

1541

1542

1543

1544

1545

1546

1547

1548

1549

1550

1551

1552

1553

1554

1555

1556

1557 | recognize the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Conyers. I thank the chair. I support H.R. 4001, and that the technical amendments to title 18 are important, and I would yield to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. Sheila Jackson Lee.

Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman, let me again thank the proponent of this legislation, and I thank him for the Regulatory Reporting Act of 2015. And I add my support to it, as it provides for a listing of each rule of that agency whose violation may be punished with criminal penalties. With that, I yield back my time.

Mr. Conyers. And I yield back.

1569 Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman and
1570 the gentlelady. Are there any amendments to H.R. 4001? I
1571 am reporting quorum being present.

The question is on the motion to report the bill H.R. 4001 favorably to the House.

1574 Those in favor will respond by saying aye.

1575 Those opposed, no.

1562

1563

1564

1565

1566

1567

1568

1572

1573

1576 The ayes have it.

The bill is ordered reported favorably. Members will have two days to submit views. Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 4003 for purposes of markup, and move that the committee report the bill favorably to the House. The clerk will report the bill.

Ms. Williams. H.R. 4003, to require reports and agency rules with criminal penalties for the violation thereof, to evaluate the necessity and prudence of such rules remaining in effect.

1586 [The bill follows:]

1588

1589

1590

1591

1592

1593

1587 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the bill is considered as read and open for amendment at any point. I will begin by submitting my opening statement into the record in support of this legislation, and recognize the gentlewoman from California, Ms. Walters, for her opening statement regarding her bill.

Ms. Walters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The federal regulatory burden has grown dramatically over the past The discussion regarding federal regulations often revolves around compliance costs and the economic impact. This very committee often plays host to those spirited and engaging debates, yet perhaps the most concerning aspect of over-regulation occurs when criminal penalties are attached to regulatory violations. Astoundingly, nobody knows exactly how many federal regulations carry the significant penalty of criminal sanction. The vast number of federal regulations and associated criminal penalties renders absurd the statement that ignorance of the law is no excuse. regulations, with numerous technically complex requirements, pose the formidable punishment of criminal sanctions that hangs like the sword of Damocles above the heads unassuming good-faith actors. It is hard to imagine that even the most diligent individual or meticulous company can

1594

1595

1596

1597

1598

1599

1600

1601

1602

1603

1604

1605

1606

1607

1608

1609

1610

1611

1612

1613

1614

1615

1616

1617

1618

1619

1620

1621

1622

1623

1624

1625

1626

1627

1628

1629

1630

1631

1632

1633

1634

be in full compliance with this daunting mandate. Unfortunately, this burden disproportionately impacts individuals in small business that lack the considerable resources to comply.

To further complicate matters, many of these criminal penalties are mala prohibita crimes, meaning that they are deemed wrong simply because they are prohibited, as opposed to mala in se crimes, which constitute morally indefensible conduct, the result being that an unassuming public is subject to criminal public for inadvertently and unknowingly violating obscure federal regulations. My bill initial step to controlling those criminal penalties, regulatory overreach, reining in this and empowering Congress to reassert its authority over federal criminal The Regulatory Reporting Act of 2015 simply requires each federal agency to submit to Congress a report that lists each rule that, if violated, may result in criminal penalties. Furthermore, each agency shall provide justification such criminal penalties as to why necessary. I want to thank the chairman for his support on I want to urge my colleagues to support the this bill. Regulatory Reporting Act of 2015, and I yield back the balance of my time.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Walters follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

1636	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman.
1637	Recognize the gentleman from Michigan for his opening
1638	statement.
1639	Mr. Conyers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous
1640	consent to have my opening statement inserted in the record.
1641	I support the measure, and yield back the balance of my
1642	time.
1643	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman.
1644	His statement will be made part of the record.
1645	[The prepared statement of Mr. Conyers follows:]
1646	****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman Goodlatte. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. Jackson Lee. I thank you, and the reason I wish to comment, is because I want to make sure that I comment that I was speaking of the H.R. 4003 earlier. So I add my support for the Regulatory Reporting Act of 2015, which would require every federal agency, in consultation with the Attorney General, to submit a report to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, listing each rule of that agency whose violation may be punished with criminal penalties, and speaks to the broader issue of how much criminalization we are engaged it. So I support that legislation. Let me correct my earlier statement, for the earlier bill, which is H.R. 4001, Fix the Footnotes Act of 2015, and I support that

1661 as being offered to make technical amendments to title 18 of 1662 the U.S. Code based on the law revision, counsel footnotes 1663 in that title, and I certainly support us making sure that 1664 we have an efficient system and efficient documents dealing 1665 with the criminal code. So I support both H.R. 4003, and 1666 H.R. 4001. With that I yield back my time. 1667 Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman. 1668 Are there any amendments to H.R. 4003? 1669 A reporting quorum being present, the question is on 1670 the motion to report the bill, H.R. 4003 favorably to the 1671 House. Those in favor will say aye. 1672 Those opposed, no. 1673 The ayes have it. 1674 The bill is ordered reported favorably. Members will 1675 have two days to submit views. Pursuant to notice, I now 1676 call up H.R. 4023 for the purpose of markup, and move that 1677 the committee report the bill favorably to the House. The 1678 clerk will report the bill. 1679 Ms. Williams. H.R. 4023, to eliminate unused sections 1680 of the United States Code and for other purposes. 1681 [The bill follows:] 1682 ****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the bill is considered as read and open for amendment at any point. I will begin by recognizing myself to submit my opening statement in support of this legislation, for the record, and recognize the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Chabot, for his opening statement on his bill.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]

Mr. Chabot. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank you for holding this markup on H.R. 4023, the Clean Up the Code Act of 2015. I also want to thank the co-sponsors of this legislation: yourself, Mr. Chairman, also Ranking Member Conyers, ranking member of the Crime subcommittee, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Forbes, and Mr. Bishop. In 2008, the Heritage Foundation published a report that there were approximately 4,450 federal crimes in the U.S. code. 2013, this Committee asked the Congressional Research Service to review the Code and update this number, only to be told that they lacked the manpower and resources to accomplish that task. When this is the answer given in response to a congressional request, it is pretty clear it is an indication that there are too many laws out there, and

1691

1692

1693

1694

1695

1696

1697

1698

1699

1700

1701

1702

1703

1704

1705 | the Code needs to be cleaned up.

1706

1707

1708

1709

1710

1711

1712

1713

1714

1715

1716

1717

1718

1719

1720

1721

1722

1723

1724

1725

1726

1727

Related to the very issue at the heart of my bill, doing away with the unnecessary federal laws, the ABA Journal Daily News published an article entitled, "Federal Laws Multiply: Jail Time for Misappropriating Smokey the Bear Image?" Well, thanks to this bill, that will no longer be an issue. H.R. 4023 looks to eliminate nine provisions within title 18 of the U.S. Code, that in some cases have never once been prosecuted since their enactment. This bill will make an action, like misuse of the Smokey the Bear character, no longer an offense subject to a criminal penalty. While it may be desirable to prohibit folks from violating certain laws, they should not be subject to criminal penalties for doing so. This bipartisan legislation is aimed at doing exactly what the bill title says, clean up the code. If there were too many laws on the books for the Congressional Research Service to count with the manpower and resources they have available to them, let's help them out and get rid of the easy ones. think the ones in this legislation are the easy ones. that, I would ask my colleagues to support the legislation and yield back.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Chabot follows:]

1728 ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman, and recognizes the gentleman from Michigan for his opening statement.

Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman and members, I support the measure, compliment my colleague, Mr. Chabot, and ask that my statement be included in the record. And I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentleman, and without objection his statement will be made a part of the record.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Conyers follows:]

1740 | ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman Goodlatte. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. Jackson Lee.

Ms. Jackson Lee. I thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me add my appreciation to Mr. Chabot and the sponsors of this legislation, Clean Up the Code Act. Many of us grew up on Smokey the Bear, and he is certainly a favorite, but I would make the argument that we would hope that that would not be a criminal offense, with fines and incarceration, or at least not incarceration. And we think these are important moments, so I want to thank him for the Clean Up the Code Act of 2015, and add my support to it, and yield back my

1752	time.	
1753	Chairman Goodlatte. The chair thanks the gentlewoman.	
1754	Are there any amendments to H.R. 4023?	
1755	Mr. Farenthold. Mr. Chairman.	
1756	Chairman Goodlatte. What purpose does the gentleman	
1757	from Texas seek recognition?	
1758	Mr. Farenthold. Move to strike the last word.	
1759	Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman is recognized for	
1760	five minutes.	
1761	Mr. Farenthold. I did want to point out, after an	
1762	advertising campaign, it is actually "Smokey Bear," not	
1763	"Smokey the Bear," just like it is "Easter Bunny," and not	
1764	"Easter the Bunny."	
1765	I just wanted to make sure the record was clear on	
1766	that.	
1767	Ms. Jackson Lee. If the gentleman will yield.	
1768	Mr. Farenthold. I will yield.	
1769	Ms. Jackson Lee. Thank you. Thank you so very much.	
1770	However he is called, we loved him. So thank you so very	
1771	much. Yield to you.	
1772	Mr. Farenthold. Yep. Thank you, and I yield back.	
1773	Chairman Goodlatte. And the same would go for Woodsy	
1774	Owl, I think too, right?	
1775	All right, if there are no amendments to H.R. 4023, and	
1776	a reporting quorum being present, the question is on the	

ı			
1777	motion to report the bill, H.R. 4023, favorably to the		
1778	House.		
1779	All those in favor respond by saying, aye.		
1780	Those opposed, no.		
1781	The ayes have it.		
1782	And the bill is ordered reported favorably. Members		
1783	will have two days to submit views.		
1784	Ms. Jackson Lee. Thank you for that important		
1785	clarification.		
1786	Chairman Goodlatte. Pursuant to notice, I now call up		
1787	H.R. 2830 for purposes of markup, and move that the		
1788	committee report the bill favorably to the House. The Clerk		
1789	will report the bill.		
1790	Ms. Williams. H.R. 2830, to make technical amendments		
1791	to update statutory references to certain provisions		
1792	classified to title 2, United States Code.		
1793	[The bill follows:]		
1794	******* COMMITTEE INSERT *******		

Chairman Goodlatte. Without objection, the bill is considered as read and open for amendment at any point, and I will begin by recognizing myself for an opening statement.

The Office of the Law Revision Counsel has an ongoing responsibility under Section 285(b) of title 2 of the United States Code and assist the House Judiciary Committee in the revision and codification of federal statutes. In order to maintain and improve the United States Code, the Office of

1803

1804

1805

1806

1807

1808

1809

1810

1811

1812

1813

1814

1815

1816

1817

1818

1819

1820

1821

1822

1823

1824

1825

1826

1827

the Law Revision Counsel must occasionally undertake editorial reclassification projects to reorganize areas of the law that have outgrown their original boundaries, or to eliminate organizational units that are no longer efficient. The Office assures us that the decision to transfer provisions in the United States Code is not undertaken lightly.

After careful study, the Law Revision Counsel recently identified certain organizational deficiencies in the Code that need to be corrected, and accordingly undertook the necessary changes. As a result, three recent editorial reclassification efforts are reflected in the next three bills we will mark up today. I will revise that to say, we are going to mark up this first one, and then we will save the other two for our next markup session. So we will not have to return after we recess for lunch. The Office of the Law Revision Counsel has carefully prepared these reclassification bills and submitted them to the committee for our consideration. The purpose of the first bill we will mark up is to update citations in laws classified at title 2 of the United States Code. H.R. 2830 will amend these citations to accurately reflect the new location of the corresponding provisions in the U.S. Code, in light of the recent editorial reclassification of title 2. I want to thank Ranking Member Conyers for sponsoring this bill along

with me today.

1828

1829

1830

1831

1832

1833

1834

1835

1836

1837

1838

1839

1840

1841

1842

1843

1844

1845

1846

1847

1848

1849

1850

1851

1852

Title 2 of the U.S. Code includes all of the laws governing Congress and the legislative branch. For example, it contains laws pertaining to congressional gifts and travel, representational allowances, the student repayment program, compensation of representatives, senators and staff, and the preference for the purchase of Americanmade goods. The reorganization of title 2 for the purposes of the online version of the Code took place on February 1, 2014. Because chapters 3 and 4 of title 2 far outgrew their original boundaries, the Office of Law Revision Counsel reorganized these two chapters into 11 new chapters, in order to set forth more clearly the provisions relating to the House of Representatives and the Senate. No statutory text was altered by the reorganization. The provisions were merely transferred from one place in title 2 to another.

As a result of the reclassification, title 2 now better exhibits the laws governing congressional pay and benefits, ethics, leadership, and administration, just to name a few. It is important to note that the Law Revision Counsel advises us that the short-term inconvenience of adjusting to new Code citations is greatly outweighed by the benefit of much-needed long-term improvements in the organizational structure of the United States Code.

Further, to eliminate any confusion, the Office

provides a comprehensive guide to the old and new Code citations on its website, uscode.house.gov. With the enactment of this legislation, the citations in our public laws that refer to Code sections altered by the reorganization will be updated to reflect the changes made to title 2. For the foregoing reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this important bill, and I am pleased to recognize the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Conyers, for his opening statement.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Goodlatte follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman, I thank you. I commend you for making this reclassification, which makes the law clearer, and I ask unanimous consent to have my statement made a part of the record, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman Goodlatte. Thank you, Mr. Conyers. And

1870	without objection, your entire opening statement will be	
1871	made a part of the record.	
1872	[The prepared statement of Mr. Conyers follows:]	
1873	**************************************	
4074		
1874	Chairman Goodlatte. Are there any amendments to H.R.	
1875	2830? A reporting quorum being present, the question is on	
1876	the motion to report the bill 2830, favorably to the House.	
1877	Those in favor will say, aye.	

1878

Those opposed, no.

1879 The ayes have it.

1880

1881

1882

1883

1884

1885

1886

1887

1888

1889

1890

1891

1892

1893

1894

1895

1896

1897

1898

1899

1900

1901

1902

1903

And the bill is ordered reported favorably. Members will have two days to submit views. And we will save the two remaining bills on the agenda for our next markup, which we anticipate will be the week after Thanksgiving, and I want to thank all of the members of the committee for their participation in these important bills that we have marked up today.

Ms. Jackson Lee. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Goodlatte. What purpose does the gentlewoman from Texas seek recognition?

Ms. Jackson Lee. Well, I think it is appropriate for the years of service that Mr. Conyers has given, and the collaboration that both of you have had, and I have been privileged to join you with Mr. Sensenbrenner, to say this was truly a historic day. It is not often that we spend a period of time on criminal justice laws, as much as this committee has such a broad jurisdiction, and so many responsibilities. I think we have commended ourselves, meaning Republicans and Democrats, on a committee that in many instances may have disagreements, rightly so that we can say that the criminal justice system, as long as its history has been, it is one of the oldest aspects of justice, is that criminal code, to say that we have been able to confront it in a positive way, to be able to improve

the lives of Americans. So I want to thank everybody on the committee, and I think this was a very, very special day in the history of the Judiciary Committee. Thank you.

Chairman Goodlatte. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. Jackson Lee. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Chairman Goodlatte. I thank the gentlewoman. She makes a very good point, and I appreciate her leadership on this issue, and I thank her for recognizing the ranking member of the committee, who has worked long and hard on this committee, and I know how important criminal justice reform issues are to him. And I commit to both of you, and to all the members of the committee, that we are not done with this -- that we have more bills to do in prison reform, in policing strategies, in juvenile justice and other areas that I know the gentlewoman and others on the committee are very interested in, and we are going to move ahead with all due speed to bring those forward to the committee and mark them up and get them to the floor of the House as well. have a great opportunity here, and we should not squander it.

So I thank all the members of the committee for their participation today.

1927 Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman.

1904

1905

1906

1907

1908

1909

1910

1911

1912

1913

1914

1915

1916

1917

1918

1919

1920

1921

1922

1923

1924

1925

1926

1928 Chairman Goodlatte. The gentleman from Michigan is

1929	recognized.
------	-------------

1930

1931

1932

1933

1934

1935

1936

Mr. Conyers. Mr. Chairman, and to the gentlelady from Texas, I want to thank both of you and a number of other members on this Committee, for expediting, improving, and making more available the clear meaning of the important judiciary legal decisions that are made in the Committee on the Judiciary. I thank all of you, and yield back the balance of my time.

1937 Ms. Jackson Lee. Thank you.

1938 Chairman Goodlatte. This concludes our business for 1939 today. Thanks to all our members for attending. The markup 1940 is adjourned.

1941 [Whereupon, at 12:04 p.m., the committee adjourned subject to the call of the chair.]